

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 24th November 2008 at Bishop Wand School, Laytons Lane, Sunbury-on-Thames**

**County Council Members:**

**Mrs Denise Turner-Stewart (Chairman)\*  
Mr Victor Agarwal\*  
Mr Ian Beardsmore\*  
Mr Laurie Burrell  
Mrs Carol Coleman  
Mr Frank Davies\*  
Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos\***

**Borough Council Members:**

**Councillor Gerry Forsbrey\*  
Councillor Denise Grant\*  
Councillor John Packman  
Councillor Jack Pinkerton\*  
Councillor Robin Sider\*  
Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley\*  
Councillor George Trussler\***

**\* = present**

(All references to items refer to the Agenda for the meeting)

**67/08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**  
Apologies for absence were received from Mr Burrell and Mrs Coleman and Councillor Packman.

**68/08 MINUTES (ITEM 2)**  
The Minutes of the meeting held on 29th September 2008 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

**69/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 3)**  
No declarations of interest were made.

**70/08 PETITIONS (ITEM 4)**  
One petition was presented with regard to installing traffic calming humps in Thetford Road. This request was noted.

Two petitions were received regarding Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in Lammas Close and George Street separately. These were taken together as they related to the same subject. Mrs Saliagopoulos strongly supported the petitions, and requested that pilot CPZ schemes be implemented in these two areas and soon.

**Resolved:**

- (i) The Area Director take the request for a pilot CPZ scheme to the Local Highways Manager and the On Street Parking Group.

A fourth petition was received requesting a barrier on Walton Bridge Road. Councillor Sider expressed his support for the petition. The petition was noted.

**71/08**

**MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 5)**

Eight Member questions were received as set out in the annex attached together with the answers given.

**72/08**

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**

Eight public questions were received as set out in the annex attached together with the answers given.

**73/08**

**HEATHROW AIRTRACK CONSULTATION (ITEM 9)**

It was agreed that this item would be taken as the next on the agenda.

The Chairman welcomed Iain Reeve, Mike Noakes from BAA and Richard Morris from CJ Associates to the meeting.

Iain Reeve summarised the proposed Surrey County Council response to the consultation, continuing to support the scheme but seeking to negotiate on several key issues including level crossings and parking issues. He invited Members to ask questions of BAA and provide comments to Executive to inform the County Council's response.

There was a wide ranging discussion about the proposals and Members sought clarification and further information on a number of issues.

The Chairman proposed that the recommendation in the report was amended to enable Members to reflect their concerns with the proposals. This was agreed by the Committee.

**Resolved:**

- (i) The Local Committee ask BAA to review these proposals in view of the significant concerns raised in relation to Spelthorne and asked that BAA resolve the concerns set out below to the satisfaction of the Local Committee.
  - As the High St Station proposal had been removed, there was no clear benefit for Staines Town Centre,

as there would be no incentive for more shoppers to come to Staines and the number of drivers was unlikely to reduce significantly but congestion would increase.

- Clear explanation of why the High Street Station proposal had been abandoned needed to be provided as no proof had been provided regarding a lack of demand.
- More detailed proposals for the Chord were required addressing the issues of disruption to traffic, the effect on the Elmsleigh Centre and the entrance to the car park.
- Parking issues had not been addressed. There were already not enough spaces and some would be lost because of the Chord.
- The issue of the impact of significantly increased down-times on level crossings remained a serious concern. Not enough details of the impact had been put in the public domain.
- Thorpe Road level crossing was already heavily congested and was set to get much worse because of Airtrack. Measures needed to be taken to address this.
- Information regarding the maximum single closure time during peak hours should be provided to further inform discussions.
- Concerns raised regarding the viability of the project given the economic downturn and the break-up of BAA.
- Shopping modelling should be carried out to assess the impact of the scheme on Staines.
- Further clarification regarding fares to London was requested and in particular, whether passengers using Staines station to get to London Paddington via Heathrow would be required to pay a 'Premium Fare'.
- Further detail on plans for landscaping on Staines Moor and Stanwell Moor requested.
- Under current proposals there was not enough mitigation of the adverse effects of the scheme for there to be clear benefit to Spelthorne.

**74/08****ANNUAL REPORT ON TRADING STANDARDS (ITEM 7)**

The Chairman welcomed Peter Howes who presented the report.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To note the initiatives being taken by the Trading Standards Service and the outcomes of the review of the service.

- (ii) Trading Standards be thanked for their continued excellent work, particularly with regard to the Foot and Mouth crisis last year.

**75/08****C234, THAMES STREET, LOWER SUNBURY – PROPOSED 20MPH ZONE (ITEM 8)****Resolved:**

- (i) the proposed 20mph zone on Thames Street broadly between its junctions with Green Street and French Street, Green Street between its junctions with Thames Street and Church Street, Church Street between its junctions with Green Street and Thames Street and The Avenue between its junctions with Saxonbury Avenue and Thames Street be approved.
- (ii) the proposed 20mph zone set out in (i) above be advertised by public notice.
- (iii) Subject to no objection being received the 20mph zone be implemented.
- (iv) If an objection to the proposal was received before the end of the objection period, it be determined by the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and the Local Electoral Division Member.
- (v) Construction of the proposal be funded from the 2009/10 Local Transport Plan budget at a cost of £20,000.

**76/08****SELF RELIANCE PROJECTS (ITEM 10)****Resolved:**

- (i) That to date the progress of the programme was achieving the desired outcomes.
- (ii) That the bid for £24,000 as set out in paragraph 1.7 be approved.

**77/08****MEMBERS FUNDS (ITEM 11) AND ADDENDUM REPORT**

It was reported that £200 of the £1000 allocated to the Staines Players under delegated authority for costumes be used instead for lighting.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To note the changed of use of funding of £200 by Staines players (para 2.1).
- (ii) To note funding approved under delegated authority (paras 2.1-2.4).
- (iii) To approve funding of £8500 for replacement windows at Kenyngton Manor School to be funded by Mr Beardsmore £8309 and Mr Davies £191.
- (iv) To approve funding of £6000 towards costs of refurbishment of the tennis courts at Cedars Park, Sunbury from Mr Davies' allocation.

- (v) To approve funding of £3600 for the installation of benches in Stanwell from Mr Agarwal's allocation.
- (vi) To approve funding of £3353 for the Youth Café from Mrs Saliagopoulos' allocation subject to contributions from Borough Councillors from the Neighbourhood Grants funding.
- (vii) To defer a decision on funding of £12000 for refurbishments to Stanwell Youth Centre from the capital allocation until the next meeting pending further information being obtained regarding the number of young people using the centre and how much could be allocated from Mr Agarwal's revenue allocation.
- (viii) To approve funding of £6000 for equipment for the Live & Direct project, from the capital allocation.

**78/08**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING (ITEM 12)**

The next meeting would be held on Monday 26th January at Ashford Youth Centre, Kenilworth Road, Ashford.

The meeting which commenced at 7.00pm ended at 9.35 pm

Chairman.....



**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SPELTHORNE – 24 November 2008**

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

**Laurie Burrell asked the following question:**

“Recently Spelthorne Borough Council has been removing charity notices from trees and lamp posts in High Street, Shepperton, and requesting businesses to clear 'A' Boards from the pavements. Yet for some unaccountable reason no action has been taken against property developers who attach directional signs to lamp posts and highway signs directing potential customers to their housing developments.

Has Surrey County Council Highways Department authorised these directional signs to be attached to the lamp posts and highway signs in Surrey?

If so, does the agency or developer who erects them pay a fee to the Surrey County Council permitting the signs to be attached to our property?

If a fee is paid how much is it, and does it cover a specified length of time?

If these signs are erected without permission, what steps are being taken to ensure they are removed ASAP, so as to ensure that we do not have unnecessary clutter on our street furniture?”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

SCC and Spelthorne Borough Council work together regarding the removal of charity notices and A boards, many of which are attached to street furniture in a manner that creates a hazard on the highway.

The signing of new property developments used to be authorized by the County Council for which the developer paid a fee to cover staff costs and to ensure the locations of the signs was appropriate.

However, recently revised good practice guidance on temporary signing to new housing developments has now been drafted. This was developed largely as a result of feedback from the local highway offices concerned about

the cost of removing unauthorised signs and the clutter created on the highway.

The County Council will no longer authorise the erection of temporary signs to new housing developments as it is considered this signing is no longer necessary as there is every opportunity available to obtain route planning information in advance of a journey (websites, mapping and satnav).

Such signing is also considered to be advertising to attract potential buyers and it is not permissible to erect advertising on the highway.

The County Council will no longer approve new temporary signs to housing developments and will seek to remove all unauthorised signs and recoup the full cost of removal.

**Laurie Burrell asked the following question:**

“Since the last School Crossing Patrol person was employed to cover the Laleham C of E School crossing at The Broadway, Laleham, Surrey Police have not been able to recruit a replacement. The current crossing is well used by the children and parents at school times, and in view of the difficulties to recruit staff to cover this very important responsibility, I feel that it would be more cost effective in the long term to install a 'Pelican Controlled Crossing' as suitable alternative.

Would our Local Highways and Transportation Manager support this proposal, and if so could it be added to the list of schemes for assessment in February 2009?”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

I have added the proposal to our list of schemes that will be assessed against the objectives of the Local Transport Plan to reduce congestion, improve accessibility, safety and the environment and to coordinate work with programmed maintenance work where possible.

The prioritised list will be reported to the Local Committee next March, for Members' consideration and the allocation of funding. In the meantime, informal consultation will be carried out with residents on proposed waiting restrictions in the area. These restrictions are programmed to be implemented during the current financial year.

**Carol Coleman asked the following question:**

“Would the Local Transportation Manager please provide us with a list of schemes that have been approved by the local committee since May 2005, and that are still outstanding, along with the division for each scheme, and the reason that each scheme is outstanding?”

The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:

The following schemes are outstanding.

<b>Location &amp; Description</b>	<b>Electoral Division</b>	<b>Reason scheme is outstanding</b>
TP 26	Lower Sunbury & Halliford	Await SCC Estates / Spelthorne Borough Council to transfer land
Shepperton Road, Laleham – Bend realignment	Laleham & Shepperton	Detailed design awaited
Clockhouse Lane, Ashford, pedestrian / cycle bridge investigation	Ashford	Await funding from London Borough of Hounslow for next stage of design
Waiting Restrictions, 2 <sup>nd</sup> , Amendment	Borough Wide	Combined with later approved amendments. Implementation 2008 / 2009
<b>Russell Road, Shepperton calming review</b>	<b>Shepperton</b>	<b>Pilot scheme to be assessed</b>
<b>Laleham Road, Staines Advance signing of low bridge – On A30</b>	<b>Staines</b>	<b>Await Highways Agency</b>
Clockhouse Lane, southbound weight restriction including advance signing	Ashford	<b>Await L B Hounslow review of the effect the weight restriction would have on their highway network</b>
Waiting Restrictions, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Amendment	<b>Borough Wide</b>	<b>Combined with later approved amendments. Implementation 2008 / 2009</b>

**Carol Coleman asked the following question:**

“Did the London Mayor's paper on *Planning for a better London* - which outlines Boris Johnson's intentions to review the London Plan, go to Spelthorne Borough Council and if so what was their response? Was the area director aware of this paper which was issued in July, and if so when?”

**The Area Director gave the following answer:**



I understand from discussions with planning officers at the Borough Council, that a report on this issue did not go to the Borough Council. Within the County Council, the Economy, Environment and Housing team within the Policy and Public Affairs Service is responsible for preparing a response to this paper on behalf of the County Council. The Local partnerships Team has had no direct involvement in this process to date. As Area Director I can confirm that I have received no specific notification or requests related to this issue.

**Carol Coleman asked the following question:**

“In response to a question that I asked at the last Spelthorne Local Committee meeting regarding graffiti, in which I only received a part reply, I was promised the information regarding how much cost was incurred by the police in dealing with this crime. Is that information now available please?”

**The Area Director gave the following answer:**

The following answer was received in response to this question from Inspector Sarah Greenhalgh, Surrey police, ‘Unfortunately, it is very difficult for police to specify a cost that is incurred when dealing with offences of graffiti, as this isn't an area where we routinely keep statistics to monitor that information. I would add that with the introduction of the Surrey Public First and the use of discretion pilot, enquiries made into any offences are look at proportionately.’

**Carol Coleman asked the following question:**

“Referring back to another question that I asked at the last Spelthorne Local Committee meeting regarding flooding, the response to that question included the intention of providing a public exhibition for residents to find out how they can protect themselves and their property, and prevent some types of flooding from occurring. Has there been any progress on the organisation of that public exhibition, and when is it likely to take place, bearing in mind that it is likely that there will be local flooding incidents this winter?”

**The Area Director gave the following answer:**

Work is currently underway to produce a flood information event within Spelthorne, based on the model of similar successful events across the Country. The venue is not yet confirmed; the current working date for the event is the 25<sup>th</sup> April 2009.

The intention is that the event will bring together combination of different agencies in order to provide a one-stop shop of flooding advice for members of the public. Agencies involved in include Spelthorne Borough Council, Surrey County Council, the National Flood Forum, the Environment Agency, the Emergency Services, SCC and potentially Thames Water.

The aim is to explain to the public what different agencies do around the issue of flooding, how we are working together, how emergencies are managed and the personal responsibilities they have to protect themselves, with advice on how they can do this.

**Councillor Sider asked the following question:**

“When a person reports an issue to West Area Highways requiring attention to a highway problem, we receive an acknowledgement with an inquiry reference number. It is then extremely difficult to trace this particular number amongst the many others one may have on the computer. Can the Local Transportation Manager inform me that in this day and age of technology why the subject heading cannot be identified alongside the reference number?”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

In my email response to Councillor Sider in February, I agreed with him that the response system was not very user friendly. I had discussed the system with colleagues but was informed that there was no means of including the subject in the response as it is defined by a system setting that will be the same for every email. However, the location is recorded in the body of the email. There has been no change to the subject matter on the system since February.

I understand that some colleagues find it is easier to keep emails in preview pane. The only other way would be to forward a response to oneself and alter the subject to aid identification.

Automated replies are also sent out when work is completed and recorded on the system. When an update is sought, I suggest the best way forward is to email that request to [wah@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:wah@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Councillor Sider asked the following question:**

“I am informed via an e mail from the County Council that their data indicates that only 3 accidents have been recorded in Walton Bridge Road, Shepperton, and yet as a Ward member I know this figure to be incorrect, and that damage has been occasioned to two individual properties and the development known as Swan Walk and the bus stop outside 'Wantage' on more than three occasions, the last accident being in October of this year in which one dwelling had its wall completely demolished yet again, damage of which subsequently prompted residents to present a petition to Surrey County Council Local Committee ( Spelthorne ) requesting some form of safeguard to offer protection to their dwellings and persons therein. The County Council have indicated that they will monitor this site, but at this point in time do not propose to implement any scheme of protection. In view of the clear evidence of some 14 incidents over the last 6 years provided by residents in this locality

who have suffered considerable damage to their properties, and photographs which substantiate recent damage, will the Local Transportation Manager concur that this does warrant further investigation and immediate remedial action taken by the County Council prior to a permanent scheme devised to offer some form of protection to this area of Walton Bridge Road, such request being supported by the County Council Divisional Member for Laleham and Shepperton and Shepperton Town Ward Members?"

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

The collision data that the County holds is supplied by Surrey Police and records only those collisions that resulted in personal injury that required hospital treatment. During the last three years there was one collision that resulted in personal injury at this location which occurred in dark, wet conditions.

SCC does not have data on 14 incidents in 6 years at this location. During the last six years there were two further recorded collisions and both occurred in wet conditions. However it is accepted that for every recorded injury collision a further 5-6 collisions that did not cause personal injury may have occurred. Residents have supplied evidence of two recent incidents but they have not yet been recorded on our database and at this stage I do not know whether injuries were sustained.

A site meeting held last week was attended by officers from Surrey Police and SCC to assess the location and review the signs and road markings and they agreed that additional chevrons should be installed and road markings should be remarked. The street lighting is considered adequate. A test on the road surface showed the skid resistance on the bend is below that recommended and "slippery road" signs will be installed on both approaches to the bend. A series of reflectorised bollards will also be installed in the grass verge around the bend to further highlight the area during hours of darkness.

The camber of the road is under review, however a major maintenance scheme is programmed to be carried out on A244 Walton Bridge Road between Marshalls roundabout and Walton Bridge during the Walton Bridge alterations. I will recommend that the scheme incorporates a review of the kerbing and levels around the bend and makes any required adjustments during the resurfacing programme.

**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**John Carruthers asked the following question:**

"It has been nationally reported that due to flaws in parking regulations drafted in 2004 that are being applied within Surrey, £2.8m has or is to be refunded to motorists.

What assurance can be given that anything of the present parking regime both in and outside parking zones are sound, can be applied and will be enforced within Spelthorne, and please specify what this is?"

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following answer:**

The issue to which you refer related specifically to Guildford and on-street parking charges. The Traffic Regulation Orders for Spelthorne and day to day operations were and will continue to be unaffected by this situation. The County works in partnership with the Borough to enforce on-street regulations in Spelthorne which are sound, to the best of our knowledge. If we become aware of any issues which necessitate a change in this view, we would act accordingly.

**Ian Robinson asked the following question:**

"I wish to ask when will SCC Highways (West) carry out my 18-month old request to trim the SCC tree overhanging my roof and front garden, and now also overhanging the public pavement at head height?"

Relevant correspondence has been sent to the Local Highways Manager. In summary, approval Reference No. 900877783, Job No. 51014770 has been granted, but no definite completion date has yet been given. Conditional permission for me to appoint and pay for an approved arborist has been granted, but this would cost me almost £400. I feel this work should be paid for out of the SCC budget, to which I contribute over £2000 per year in Council tax."

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following response:**

Members have allocated an additional £45,000 funding this financial year to address many of the works needed on highway trees. Work to the County Council's standards will be carried out to the tree outside No. 33 Kingsmead Avenue. This is included on a programme of tree work that has recently commenced.

**Peter and Vicki Lenoel asked the following question:**

"Why are the two VAS signs in Lower Hampton Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, located in the 40mph section and not in the 30mph section between French Street and Sunbury cricket club where enforcement would enhance the safety of pedestrians in a populated area with many children and elderly residents?"

(We appreciate the likely response is that they have been deployed in the 40 mph section to prevent speeding through the bends adjacent to Stain Hill reservoir following a recent vehicle-only accident; our prime concern,

however, is the reinforcement of the 30mph limit through a heavily populated area.)

Our family has lived at 24 Lower Hampton Road since March 1983. Our house is situated on the corner of Lower Hampton Road and Harfield Road and the postcode is TW16 5PS. Not including residents' visiting grandchildren, there are 10 children under the age of 16 living in the 5PS postcode section of Lower Hampton Road in constant danger from speeding traffic.

The speed limit from Sunbury village to Sunbury cricket club is posted at 30mph. At the cricket club the speed limit increases to 40mph all the way through to the junction with Upper Sunbury Road at the Thames Water water works. It is evident that a high percentage of traffic travelling along the 30mph section of Lower Hampton Road is exceeding the speed limit. Having negotiated the speed humps through Thames Street vehicles accelerate as soon as they pass the mini-roundabout at the junction with French Street.

VAS signs would better serve our precious little community if they were sited in the 30mph section - ideally between the Darby Crescent junctions eastbound and soon after the 30mph sign westbound opposite the cricket club entrance - and calibrated accordingly. Traffic calming measures are costly and the residents believe that this section of road sees the speed limit flouted continually with many vehicles exceeding 40 and 50mph in both directions past our houses. Indeed, we believe that, proportionately, many more vehicles exceed the 30mph limit than exceed the 40mph limit where they are forced to respond to the constraints of the road.”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following response:**

Vehicle Activated Signs were installed by Surrey Police on both approaches to the bend on Lower Hampton Road in response to several incidents within the last year at the bend by Stain Hill Reservoir and to highlight the 40mph limit. We work closely with Surrey Police who use the signs reactively to address speed related complaints to seek to reduce road traffic collisions. The signs are not permanent and will be relocated when other sites present themselves. The westbound sign has already been removed as data has established the incidents involved vehicles travelling from Sunbury.

A survey into the possibility of providing a solid white line system through the bend showed that the majority of the vehicles did not cross the centre line as they negotiated the bend hence those markings would not resolve the problem. However, we will replace and re-site the bend warning sign and improve the road markings on the approach to the bend.

There were four reported incidents between French Street and Harfield Road during the last 3 years to which there was no pattern and none was speed related. The data does not highlight a problem on that length of road. Our primary concern is to investigate and treat lengths of roads that have a pattern of similar incidents.

**David Penny asked the following question:**

“There is a proposal to introduce 24/7 double yellow parking restrictions at the jct of Leacroft/Raleigh Court Staines. SCC promised to keep the residents informed on the progress of this but things seem to have stalled.

Can you therefore please advise on the following

1. The contact point for information, as we understand that AW is no longer the portfolio holder?
2. What target date has been set to notify both Leacroft Residents Association and the effected residents [for consultation purposes] of the details of the proposed regulations?”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following response:**

I am still dealing with amendments to waiting restrictions although they will now be processed through the recently formed centralized Parking Team. Residents who are likely to be affected by the proposed extension of waiting restrictions will be consulted informally during December and, where possible, residents' views will be incorporated into the proposal that will be advertised by Public Notice during January.

**Terry Lyden will ask the following question:**

“Gresham Road Staines--.Why is there no Disabled road crossing with dropped kerbs and a clear drop off zone for access to Staines Railway Station.to link up with the disabled facilities provided by the new access to Staines station on Railway property?”

The new entrance to Staines Station in Gresham Road incorporates disabled ramp access but apparently no one has thought about our Councils duty to compliment the Rail authority recognition of disabled needs by making similar disabled facilities on the road and pavements. If as expected Airtrack to T5 is sanctioned then more passengers will arrive and depart from Staines Station to the Airport some of whom will be disabled.

As it is Gresham road is often blocked with long lines of Hackney Carriages and pavements obstructed by drivers standing talking to one another. This situation, is of course much more difficult and dangerous in the dark. It would seem therefore, that to facilitate the disabled and the young and the infirm, a clear drop off area with dropped kerbs and marked road crossings should have been incorporated when the rail authority plans were agreed at council. There should be no problem in providing such facilities for the disabled as the licensing officer, Dave Watts, has already promised to move the taxi rank for 3 cars towards the Kingston Road.

I do hope you will be able to provide these facilities in the near future.”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following response:**

Improvements to accessibility in the vicinity of Staines Station has focused on the Kingston Road side of the station. I was unaware of the access improvements until you brought them to my attention.

However, I have established that South West Trains are seeking to make both entrances to Staines station accessible without steps in advance of a new lift-equipped footbridge to be installed between the platforms in a year or two. I understand their scheme involves the construction of ramps and that the work is scheduled for completion by the end of the financial year.

I would support the installation of dropped kerbs and a review of accessibility to the Gresham Road entrance to the station, mindful that accessible routes would be needed in order to arrive in the vicinity of the station. A scheme to improve accessibility to the station could be considered by Members from next years Local Allocation.

I understand that the Borough Council's proposal for the Taxi Rank on Gresham Road is not to move it but to extend it towards Gresham Road by the provision of space for three additional taxis.

**Peter Francis asked the following question:**

"Currently there is a direct (only one bus required) service from the Addlestone/Sunbury areas to Heathrow Terminals 123&4 (routes 555 and 557). However, there no direct service to Terminal 5. Can this be provided?"

At present a typical journey from Sunbury Cross to Terminal 5 takes an hour and requires at least two bus routes. (See Transport for London Journey Planner for time tables/recommended routes). This for a 5 mile journey, hardly an encouragement to use public transport! "

**Passenger Transport Officers gave the following response:**

For the opening of Terminal 5 and bearing in mind its geographical relationship with the other terminals, it was recognised by BAA, local authorities, Transport for London and bus operators that it would not always be possible to provide direct scheduled public bus services to every terminal from a certain community. A number of new and enhanced bus services have been provided to Terminal 5, supported by various one-change connecting opportunities. No bus operator came forward to provide a link from the Shepperton/Sunbury/Ashford corridor to Terminal 5. The County Council gave careful consideration as to whether to divert or extend journeys on routes 555/557, which it supports, to Terminal 5 instead of to Terminals 1,2 and 3. However, it was not felt beneficial to reduce the level of service to the latter. Unfortunately, the current budgetary position precludes the introduction of additional supported services from north Surrey to Terminal 5.

By changing from services 555/557 at Terminal 4, to London Buses services which run up to 8 times an hour, an onwards journey should be able to be made to Terminal 5 in under an hour from the Sunbury area. This onward connection can be made at no additional cost as a result of the Airport Free Fare Zone, sponsored by BAA.

**Roger Harding, Vice Chairman, Lower Sunbury Resident's Association, asked the following question:**

“Background - At a recent Area forum held on the 11<sup>th</sup> November with Spelthorne Council a presentation was made by the head of environment, Dr. Sandy Muirhead, covering the environmental impact on lower Sunbury, including promoting greener and more ecological thinking amongst residents.

This has prompted further thoughts on the impact on Lower Sunbury of the large volume of through traffic that uses Thames Street, Green Street and Fordbridge Road.

Recent survey work in Green Street performed by residents confirmed that 78% of traffic at busy times is through traffic most likely between Sunbury Cross and Walton Bridge – it has become clear that with the three sets of traffic signals at Staines Road West that it is quicker to travel between Sunbury Cross and Walton Bridge via Green Street and Fordbridge Road than the arterial road A roads provided for the purpose.

Recent ‘speed watch’ exercises held by residents in Green Street and other parts of lower Sunbury have confirmed regular abuse by motorists of the 30 mph speed limit.

Lower Sunbury has a conservation area that is effectively being undermined by the volume and speed of this traffic.

Question - What could be done to discourage through traffic from using lower Sunbury that would better preserve the environment of lower Sunbury and its conservation area? – Residents Suggestions might include a mixture of

- More extensive use of a 20 mph speed limit – particularly considering the volume of school children in the area
- Chicane barrier restrictions
- Speed tables as in Thames Street.”

**The Local Highways Manager gave the following response:**

A 20mph Zone centring on Thames Street and broadly in line with the Conservation Area is proposed elsewhere on this agenda. There is no current proposal to introduce traffic calming to Fordbridge Road or Green Street, north of its junction with Church Street. However I have added the suggestion to the list of schemes that will be assessed in accordance with the objectives of the Local Transport Plan and reported to the March meeting of this Committee



**Mr John Hirsh, Chairman LOSRA, will ask the following question:**

Background - Planning decisions by Spelthorne Council provide for a comment by the Highway Authority but there is seldom any comment included. In a number of recent cases the impact on traffic flow, safety risks and bus route timings do not appear to have been addressed by the Highway Authority.

A recent case for a takeaway food restaurant in Green Street considered by Spelthorne's Planning Committee on the 12<sup>th</sup> November does not appear to have been fully thought through. The location is in the parade of shops in the conservation area of Lower Sunbury. This parade has parking that is normally occupied by residents or shop workers. This in turn prompts double parking for those seeking to stop for supplies at the local convenience store and it might be expected that such instances would increase with a takeaway food restaurant. Even if the spaces were free, passing trade to the takeaway would most likely encourage cars to park and then reverse into the traffic stream in Green Street, a road that can both be very busy and has 28 buses per hour traversing along it. A similar establishment in Halliford village considerably disrupts local traffic as traders with vans appear to stop for breakfast snacks. The residents of the conservation area of lower Sunbury are now at risk of a similar nuisance as the Spelthorne Councillors cited no objection by the Highway Authority. Council officers pointed to the car park 50 yards away but human nature predicts that this facility would only ever be used as a last resort.

Question - Why does the highway authority not comment on these potential risks; and why does it habitually take such a passive role in important planning applications?

**The Transportation Development Control Officer gave the following response:**

There is currently parking available in the existing spaces outside the parade of shops and also in the car park over the road. If people are parking dangerously then this is a matter for the police.

The situation is actually not going to change, the Officers report to the planning committee does point out that the premises of 95 and 89A are swapping uses (89A does not need planning permission).